



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,503	02/19/2004	Shinichi Kurita	007956	4718
41161	7590	10/12/2006	Display/AHRDWRE	
DUGAN & DUGAN, PC 55 SOUTH BROADWAY TARRYTOWN, NY 10591				
			EXAMINER	
			CHAN, EMILY Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,503

Applicant(s)

KURITA ET AL.

Examiner

Emily Y. Chan

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/21/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodama masayoshi (UP 09-152569) in view of Barringer et al US Patent No. 6,034,524.

Kodama masayoshi ('569) 's teaching which expressly meets the claimed invention was discussed in the paragraph 2 of the previous office action dated on 4/21/06.

Kodama masayoshi ('569) does not teach the amended feature that his edge sensors 3a-3d contact the substrate (2).

Barringer et al ('524) disclose a test system for testing circuits on flexible substrates (see Figs. 1-6) comprising a plurality of probes (102) and substrate (13). Barringer et al ('524) exclusively teach that their a plurality of probes (102) detect the edge of the substrate while the substrate (13) is supported by the stage (see Fig. 6) by contacting the substrate (13) (see Col. 8, lines 50-52 " the two probe pads 102 are moved into contact with the substrate 13 on opposing sides").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Barringer et al ('524) into Kodama masayoshi ('569) 's apparatus for the expected benefit of providing a rapid and automated means for handing circuit substrate through an inspection process using the simultaneously application of a number of electrical probes as disclosed by Barringer et al ('524) (see Col. 3, lines 21-25).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that (1) Kodama masayoshi ('569)'s sensors 3a-3d do not appear to contact a substrate, (2) Kodama masayoshi ('569) does not disclose that sensors 3a-3d stop moving toward the edge of the substrate after the edge sensors 3a-3d detect the substrate and (3) for claims 2 and 18, Kodama masayoshi ('569) does not disclose a switch.

For the argument (1) above, the examiner agrees with applicants' position, but points out that using the edge sensor to contact a substrate is old as shown by Barringer et al ('524) (see rejection above).

For the argument (2) above, Kodama masayoshi ('569) discloses that their sensors 3a-3d are controlled by the position correcting means 8 and 9 which are programmable device, therefore, the sensors 3a-3d can be controlled to move toward the edge or stop moving toward the edge.

Art Unit: 2829

For the argument (3), Kodama masayoshi ('569) clearly disclose a switch (see SOLUTION, last five lines " the two edge sensors 3a and 3b, or 3c and 3d are switched ").

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Y. Chan whose telephone number is 571-272-1956. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha T Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax

Art Unit: 2829

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EC
9/4/06


VINH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
A-U-2829
09/05/06